NEW SERIES: VOL. 4, NO. 1—MAY, 1898.

THE THEOSOPHICAL FORUM

ISSUED BY DIRECTION AND UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA.

For free distribution to members. The T. S. in America is not responsible for any statements herein. Published by the Theosophical Society in America, at 35 Nassau Street, New York City.
A. H. SPENCER, Acting President.

Each member is invited to send questions, answers to questions, opinions, and notes upon Theosophical subjects. When necessary, the various communications will be condensed by the editor. Members should be careful to write distinctly and on one side of the paper only.

In sending questions, or answers to questions, whenever an assertion is made that such and such is a "teaching" or that "it is said in Theosophical literature," and the like, the name of author, article, volume, and page referred to must be given.

All communications should be addressed to **The Editor, Theosophical Forum, Room 1411, 35 Nassau Street, New York City.**

Entered as second-class matter at New York, N. Y., Post-office, July 25, 1895.
Issued monthly. Sent direct to each member. No losses by mail made good.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

QUESTION 108. (*Continued*)

Is autonomy necessary in T. S. If so; why?

W. W.—The T. S. is an organization of individuals devoted to the advancement of humanity and to self-improvement as a means to that end. Its cardinal ethic is absolute tolerance of all shades of belief or opinion; the avoidance of all dogmatism; and the recognition of no religion higher than Truth, and of no authority greater than the Higher Self which is a partial impersonation of the world soul.

Freedom of thought and action, so far as is consistent with one's duties and obligations to others is its principle and "Learn to stand alone and judge for yourself" its precept.

Whatever opposes this freedom or imposes limits upon mental processes and moral responsibilities, hampers individual development, dwarfs intellect, and paralyzes intuition.

Autonomy is the foe of dogmatism and abhors absolutism and superstition. Every man must learn to recognize his individual birthright as a Son of God with all men for his fellows. He can learn it only by abjuring ignorance and darkness, and seeking the

clear light within. The right of every man to his personal ownership is now matter of common and general recognition. Republics declare it is their constitutions, and older states embody it in their statutes. Civilization has stricken the fetters from the slave. Education has opened the windows of his mind and given him the universe for a landscape. Illumination will withdraw the clouds of darkness from his soul and place him in the full radiance of the oversoul.

To all these processes, autonomy with its freedom of movement in every direction and on all planes, physical, mental and moral, and its insistence upon individual development and responsibility is absolutely vital—and whatever is antagonistic to autonomy, retards the progress of humanity and clogs its feet with superfluous and crushing burdens.

QUESTION 109. (Continued.)

Is denunciation ever a duty ?

G. E. Harter.—Of persons, no. Of motives—we have no means of judging. Of private acts, no. Of official acts, of acts that affect others, of acts that affect the life of an organization, or of society, or of home or fatherland, yes. We must learn to use our "discrimination always." Suppose our country to be engaged in war for freedom. Suppose knowledge should come to one of us that one in high place were untrue to himself and his flag—was selling information for gold. Denounce the act? Of course. Denounce the actor? "If thine enemy is an hungered, feed him."

Vera Johnston.—Denunciation implies that you know the nature of the impulse which prompted the act you denounce. That hardly ever being the case, denunciation on moral grounds is mere interference. It also is loss of time. So we had much better keep our hair on. But if your cook pays a nickel for a two-cent article, denounce her immediately. That will be business.

Edward Alden.—Impersonal denunciation of wrong is always a duty ; condemn the wrongful act always, the sinful actor never. We can judge the act, perhaps, and if unmistakably wrong affirm our disapprobation ; we cannot judge the motive of the doer, and even though we were able to look into his heart and there discovered evil intent, we should cover the sinner with a mantle of charity. "Judge not that ye be not judged," meant more than the "measure" you shall receive, for it carries with it the caution that you look to it that your judgment does not condemn yourself, that your motive be pure, and that your reprobation be of the sin and not of the transgressor, else your sin be greater than his. Necessarily

judgment must be exercised with discretion, that it may not be perversive of benefit to others. Public denunciation is seldom effective of good—labor with thine adversary in secret—and yet public and general wrongs can only be met in a public manner, but ever keep the act and actor separate, and always temper denunciation with charity.

J. D. Buck.—I can imagine a condition of things where denunciation even of an individual might be a duty. Just as I can justify war, the preferring of a less to a greater evil. Such conditions do not often arise and hence need not here be considered. In all ordinary affairs of life the denunciation of an individual is a great wrong and just here comes in the principle and the application of Brotherhood. Acts may and often must be denounced, but not the actor; methods, but not the man. The motives and character of an individual constitute a realm beyond the knowledge of another individual, and acts and methods may be employed under a mistaken idea, or from ignorance which result in great harm to all concerned, when the motive of the individual actor was really good. If his motive be really sincere and good, he will repent, and endeavor to undo, as far as possible, the wrong done, and in the future avoid a repetition of the wrong act. If, however, he is denounced he is likely to become angry that his motive is so misinterpreted and so is confirmed in evil-doing. If one is really anxious to lessen the sum of human misery and the evil in the world he will be charitable to the evil-doer and beware of denunciation.

E. D. P.—However the world-at-large may view this question, the theosophist at least should unhesitatingly answer in the negative.

The broader light thrown upon "duty" by theosophical teachings should prove, to students of such, that "Denunciation" is a violation of the fundamental law of harmony. Action and reaction are equal and opposite. Adding force to currents already inharmonious can have but the one result of augmenting the disturbance; causing its expansion in ever widening circles, according to the intensity of the added energy. So that equilibrium can again be restored only when this energy in expansion having exhausted itself in that direction, and the resultant reaction setting in, according to this law, returns to the centre from which it received its primary impulse.

Denunciation is a violation of those qualities, most esteemed and loved in our fellowman, of justice, mercy, toleration, compas-

sion, etc. More than this, it is an audacious seizure upon the law of karma whereby one gratuitously constitutes himself the instrument for the punishment of another.

W. W.—That depends upon what is meant by denunciation, what is the purpose of it, and what motive prompts it.

One may denounce a contract or agreement in order to make public its termination; or a parcel of land, to secure title or usufruct by lawful condemnation. Commonly however, it is directed against one or more individuals, invokes public disapproval of their actions or objects, and connotes a hostile or aggrieved state of mind.

For denunciation to be justifiable, it should have for its purpose the prevention of wrong doing to another; the facts must be accurately known, and the motive must be strictly analyzed and shown to be without bias and entirely impersonal. To denounce merely because one disagrees no matter how vehemently—or to gratify a personal grievance or to put another to shame or discredit is quite unwarrantable and contrary to altruistic principles. The case is different when it is a question of preventing the commission of a crime. If in a throng one saw a pickpocket in the act of plying his trade, or found a sneak thief in a friend's hall taking overcoats it would be one's duty to denounce him to the police. So if one knew that a confidence man were securing employment in a bank, or a person of known immorality were seeking intimacy in an unsuspecting family, private denunciation to the responsible authority in either case might readily become a duty, and a very unpleasant one to boot.

In matters of opinion merely the safe rule is charity and tolerance, and even in cases of manifest wrong doing, where no immediate injury to others is to be apprehended, private and personal remonstrance is the proper course and denunciation unwarrantable. In all such matters be scrupulous to "judge not that ye be not judged," and defer condemnation and denunciation until seventy times seven.

Question 110.

Can any Master of Wisdom condemn an individual for doing that which he thinks is right, or for refraining from doing that which he thinks is wrong? Can any supposed command of such a Master justify wrong-doing?

J. D. Buck.—This question is preposterous. It arises from blind belief without knowledge, and leads to nothing but fanaticism

pure and simple. Might never makes right, no matter whether the power and authority be vested in Pope or Czar, Priest or King. This miserable subterfuge of placing authority above right and duty has been the curse of the human race, and nothing will so surely destroy all belief in "Masters as ideals and facts," as this sort of fanaticism. To assume that the Master knows best what is right and wrong for the individuals is to annul the duty of the individual to think and act for himself, and is only a device of the autocrat to gain authority. To say that such a thing is right because a Master or a God hath ordered it, should be faced by the challenge : Such a thing is *wrong*, therefore no Master of Wisdom could ever approve much less order it. Those who seem wholly ignorant of philosophy ought to cultivate a little common sense.

Question iii.

Why have there been so many disturbances in the T. S. since its formation ?

J. W. L. Keightley.—These disturbances, like every other, are caused by reaction away from the object originally proposed. Such reaction inheres in the polar nature of existence. It will be found in churches, in nations, in eras, quite as much as in human lives, and especially in a Society like ours where an intense and continuous aspiration towards the inner planes of life quickens the conditions. The T. S. was founded upon Universal Brotherhood and is guided towards that ideal, is often very forcefully guided in that direction by its members. Reactions against that ideal are then inevitable, but the re-adjustment which follows upon the reaction finds us stronger, as a Society, than we were before. Not necessarily stronger in numbers, but having a stronger mental attitude, a clearer unit-mind. In the same way, "Universal Brotherhood" standing for the Spiritual Identity of All Being, which Identity must preclude the idea of "authority," other than the authority of the soul within, we should expect to find—and we do find—reactions away from the idea of mental and moral freedom and individual responsibility, towards the other pole of "authority." But the more extreme such reactions are, the greater will be the rebound back to the original ideal.

E. D. P.—Here again we see the workings of the universal law that action and reaction are equal and opposite. The growth and expansion of the T. S., great as it has been, is less marked in its

impression on the average mind than are the disturbances arising out of the consequent reactions. But their chief cause will be found, I think, in a violation of the principle of brotherhood. This principle being the first object of the T. S., the only one binding on all members, any breach of it by a member must react as an element of disturbance throughout the entire Society. Denunciation of a brother, evil speaking, and listening to such without protest, slander and imputation of bad motive will be found, upon unprejudiced examination, to be the root and mainspring of the many disturbances within the T. S.

Question 112.

Can a modern business man be a Theosophist in the real inner sense of that word? Do not the demands of his daily life make the pursuit of occultism practically impossible?

Geo. M. Coffin.—I think that any man who lives up to the teachings of Theosophy ought to be a model and successful business man. For he would be honest, just, courageous, persevering and generous, as well as prompt and punctual in the performance of every business obligation. He would possess those traits of "character" which constitute the bed-rock of commercial credit, and which in the long run give the advantage to the honest business man. Moreover the knowledge of human nature acquired through a correct study of Theosophy gives the man who has it an immense advantage over one who has it not.

The demands of the daily life of such a Theosophist would be met in the spirit of his character, and made to conform to this and in the faithful performance of his daily duties, small and great, he would find an excellent school for training in true occultism.

W. W. Gamble.—Many political and reform advocates are inclined to view our present moral, social and economic systems from a very pessimistic standpoint. While deploring our present degenerate age, they fail to perceive the wonderful amalgamating process going on between all nations and peoples of the earth. In our own country especially, the civilized and the barbarian meet on a common level. While the moral tone of the most refined may be somewhat lowered, there is more than a corresponding elevation of the degraded, for a pure unselfish man—a Theosophist—will exert much more influence on the community in which he lives than one of evil tendencies. If Theosophists would elevate the moral tone of

the world, they must live and mingle with the people, and to do that honestly, they must do something to earn their living. They must engage in some business. If the modern business methods are immoral it would be the Theosophist's duty to conduct his in strict accord with honesty and altruism and thus assist to raise the moral business tone of the world. Yes, a Theosophist can very properly engage in business.

Jas. Albert Clark.—Surveying humanity from the widest possible outlook and with the aid of the habits of thought which the study of evolution fosters, the business man is a legitimate product. He finds himself where his Karma has placed him. Wherever he is, there duty lies. He can be a Theosophist in the line of duty. With bluff old Carlyle, he can say, "blessed is the man who finds his work to do; let him ask for no other blessedness." But a *modern* business man is not of necessity he who adds sand to sugar for gain. The cells in the human organism were apportioned to duty in colonies and pursue their work. The business men of our age are a colony in the structure of society. Industrial and commercial civilization demands their constant and sincere work, and the sincerity is the measure of the standing of the Theosophist. If we cannot be practically useful, it is in vain that we attempt to teach humanity that we are theoretically orthodox in our recognized sphere of moral obligation.

The "demands of daily life" have no constraining force where and when not courted. The "pursuit of occultism" is practically possible to the Theosophist who is "Lord of all lusts, quit of the priests and books." Even with a besieging force of those fantasies, he "can rise by daily sojourn with these Karmic foes to lovelier verities." "Let each act assail a fault or help a merit grow." "Far hath he gone, who treads down one fond offence." This assumes that the path is always beset with offences which surely come.

"Lo! like fierce foes slain by some warrior, ten sins along these stages lie."

In the very effort of the practice of occultism, he "purgeth himself of self and helps the world." And it is in the world he must do it, not in the retreat of the ascetic. The best Theosophist is he who "even as a man 'mongst men fulfilling all," shows to the world our transcendant power of transfiguring the commonplace, which reduced to plain talk, means, square with the world, and that recast into our speech is interpreted "in harmony with the universal order of things."

SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION.

FOR THE USE OF BRANCHES.

The following subjects are supplied as being suitable for discussion at branch meetings. They are by various students who have had experience in conducting such meetings. It should be clearly understood that statements made herein are *suggestions for discussion*, are not official, nor in any way authoritative. Similar outlines will be gladly received by the editor, who reserves the right to make such alterations in their construction as may seem advisable.—EDITOR.

THEOSOPHICAL STUDY.

Necessity of an accurate knowledge of the fundamental principles of the belief. The best statement of these in *The Secret Doctrine*. Every member should be able to define *Theosophy*, explain what is meant by *Karma*, *Reincarnation*, *Law of Cycles*, *Seven Principles*, *Correspondences*, etc. Each branch member should in turn write a short paper on each of these headings, and read it to the Branch where it should be discussed and subjected to friendly and helpful criticism. Other methods of study. Value of examinations, if they can be arranged. Classes for the study of one of the standard books under the guidance of an older student. Reading of books not sufficient. Deep thought over each new idea advisable. Good plan to write out a synopsis of what has been read. Writing short articles for country newspapers good practise.

REFERENCES.

Article "Occult Study," in Five Years of Theosophy. Article "Of Studying Theosophy," in Path, vol. 4, p. 319.

MEDITATION.

Why it is necessary. Its importance and value. The first step in true practical occultism. Two kinds of meditation, the "quiet hour" and the continuous meditation. Their relation. The first an introduction to the second. In what does continuous meditation consist? The beginning of the soul life. Its effect upon the Inner Man. The growth of the Inner Man dependant upon it. The essence of Raja Yoga. Its relation to prayer. Meditation seldom understood by students.

REFERENCES.

Letters That Have Helped Me, p.p. 51—56. Article "Elixir of Life," in Five Years of Theosophy. Culture of Concentration, by W. Q. Judge. Article "Contemplation," in Five Years of Theosophy.

PSYCHISM.

Phenomena of psychism should be studied theoretically by members. Difference between psychic and noetic action. Psychism often mistaken for intuition and for the manifestations of the soul. Psychics, the victims of "feelings," "impressions." They are influenced by external forces. Difficulty of correct mental intrepretation, also of discriminating between preconceived ideas and records of the astral light. The Astral Light or recording ether. Its images reflected upon the brain and nervous centers. Importance of realizing the com-

monplace character of mind reading and other psychic phenomena, including vague forecasts of the future, hardly ever accurate but often containing a small percentage of truth. "Use discrimination always."

REFERENCES.

Psychic and Noetic Action. Lucifer, vol. 7, p.p. 89, 177, Letters That Have Helped Me, p.p. 25-27 and 31. Ocean of Theosophy, chapters xvi and xvii.

MOHAMMEDANISM.

The personal history of Mohammed. Born at Mecca, 570. Was a shepherd-warrior. Married. Was over forty when he devoted himself to meditation. His visions and the revelation of his mission. His opposition to Judaism. His wars and death in 632. The Koran and exoteric Mohammedanism. Sunnites and Shiites the two orthodox sects. Their hatred of each other. Intolerance and bigotry characterise the Mohammedan priesthood. The mysticism of the Sufis. Sufism proper is far older than Mohammedanism, being pure mysticism expressed to some extent in terms peculiar to Mohammedanism. Pantheistic and theosophic. The abuses of Sufism. Occultism among the Sufis. The Babis. Their pantheistic and communistic doctrines. General Mohammedan belief in the coming of a "divinely guided" Mahdi, or deliverer. This belief common to all religions.

REFERENCES.

Lucifer, vol. ii., p. 390, vol. iii, p. 126; Path, vol. i, p.p. 41, 68, 108, 139, 180, 199; The Koran.

THEOSOPHICAL NEWS AND WORK.

The proceedings of the office during the past month have been practically confined to correspondence with various centers looking to the establishment of new Branches or reorganization of such already established Branches as have remained loyal to the T. S. A. through the present crisis. Our position as to Branches is as follows:

Twenty-eight Branches now stand fully organized, viz.:

Baltimore T. S.	Baltimore, M. D.
Blavatsky T. S.	Washington, D. C.
Brooklyn T. S.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Cincinnati T. S.	Cincinnati, Ohio.
Chrestos T. S.	Colorado Springs, Col.
Columbus T. S.	Columbus, Ohio.
Dayton T. S.	Dayton, Ohio.
Des Moines T. S.	Des Moines, Iowa.
Detroit T. S.	Detroit, Mich.
Fort Wayne T. S.	Fort Wayne, Ind.
Harmony T. S.	St. Louis, Mo.
Houston T. S.	Houston, Texas.
Indianapolis T. S.	Indianapolis, Ind.
1st T. S. of Jamestown	Jamestown, N. Y.
Lowell T. S.	Lowell, Mass.
Massasoit T. S.	E. Providence, R. I.

Memphis T. S. ..... Memphis, Tenn.
Middletown T. S. ..... Middletown, Ohio.
Nashville T. S. ..... Nashville, Tenn.
New Orleans T. S. ..... New Orleans, La.
Sandusky T. S. ..... Sandusky, Ohio.
Santa Cruz T. S. ..... Santa Cruz, Cal.
Seattle T. S. ..... Seattle, Wash.
Staten Island T. S. ..... Staten Island, N. Y.
Upasika T. S. ..... Brooklyn, N. Y.
Waltham T. S. ..... Waltham, Mass.
Yonkers T. S. ..... Yonkers, N. Y.
Hackensack T. S. ..... Hackensack, N. J.

Loyal members sufficient to form Branches are known to exist at the following points, viz: Chicago, Ill.; Sioux City, Iowa; Boston, Mass.; Kansas City, Mo.; Omaha, Neb.; New York, N. Y.; Portland, Ore.; Pittsburg, Pa.; Providence, R. I.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Tacoma, Wash.;

These centers are expected to fully organize very shortly.

Conference of members of the Theosophical Society in America in Boston and vicinity, held at 29 Temple Place, Easter Sunday, April 10, 1898.

Called to order at 2.20 P. M. by Mrs. E. L. D. Moffett. Mr. Arthur B. Griggs as the only surviving member of the original New York Society now actively identified with Theosophy in this country was called to the chair. L. F. Wade was elected as secretary.

Reports showed that many members in the following Branches adhere to the T. S. A. and its Constitution: Lowell, Waltham, Providence, Massasoit, Malden, Beacon, Boston (and at large), and Somerville Branches. Remarks were also made by Mr. Scales of the Chelmsford Branch. Telegrams, letters and an advance copy of the FORUM were read.

The following declaration was signed by all members present:

To Alexander H. Spencer,

Acting President, of the Theosophical Society in America.

Having been advised that at a convention of delegates held at Chicago on or about February 18, 1898, there was declared adopted a resolution purporting to merge the Theosophical Society in America into a new Society known as Universal Brotherhood; and that the said delegates adopted a new constitution for the Theosophical Society in America, making it a mere department of the said Universal Brotherhood, and entirely subservient to the constitution of the new society;

And having been advised that a large number of the members of the Theosophical Society in America have repudiated the action of the above mentioned delegates and declared their intention of continuing the said Society on the old lines and under the old Constitution thereof and such amendments as may be constitutionally made according to the provisions contained therein;

This is to notify you and our fellow members of the Theosophical Society in America that we desire to continue our membership in our several Branches of the said Society, and not to become ourselves, and to have any of our Branches become members of the Universal Brotherhood, and not to have any of the said

Branches, nor the whole Theosophical Society in America nor any part thereof merged in the said Universal Brotherhood, nor affiliated therewith, nor in any way bound by the constitution thereof.

We know of ourselves that the above mentiond action of the Chicago delegates was morally void and having been advised by competent authority that it was legally of no effect, we propose to maintain the organization of our several Branches and go on with Theosophical work on the old lines.

Signed by : A. B. Griggs, C. H. Hobson, Helen M. Coy, Charles H. Hobson, E. I. Brooks, Andrew G. Armstrong, Herbert A. Richardson, Elizabeth Worcester Mills, Mary F. Barns, Ellen L. D. Moffett, Alice Elizabeth Shedd, Robert A. Chandler, L. F. Wade, Frederick E. Shaw. Remarks were made by several members, and it was voted to meet at Room 5, 29 Temple Place, the first Sunday in each month at 2 P. M.

L. F. WADE, *Secretary*.

FOREIGN NEWS.

KRISTIANIA, March 30th, 1898.

To the President of the T. S. in Europe, acting at the Convention in London, February 23rd, 1898.

MR. SIDNEY CORYN :

Dear Sir and Brother—In the twenty-seventh February number of "The Crusader" are recorded details of the deliberations and resolutions carried at the Convention of the T. S. in Europe, assembled in London, February 23rd last, and advice is given to the National Branches of "what to do and how to do it," in order to affirm and carry out the resolutions of the Convention.

From this publication we learn, that the Majority of the Convention resolved to transform the T. S. in Europe, into a Literary Association, under a new organization called "*Universal Brotherhood.*"

As no notification of any alteration or amendment in the Constitution was sent to me in due time, nor apparently to any other Executive Councillor, I must declare the above mentioned step as an illegal action and a violation of Article IX of the Constitution of 1896; and as any resolution, even if unanimously carried, is void and null, when it militates against the Constitution, the only thing I find to have to communicate to the members of the T. S. in E. (Norway) is that the Convention has made a great mistake and separated without finishing its task.

I should only fail in my duty as Executive Councillor for the National Branch in Norway, if I did not uphold the Constitution of the T. S. in Europe, now in force, as well as its By-Laws for the T. S. in E. (Norway), and oppose every attempt at effecting alterations of an oppressive and illegal nature.

As to the principle of being governed by an autocratic "Leader," I find it inadmissable and entirely contrary to the Law of Evolution. A child is under guardianship, the adult acts under responsibility. As with persons so with Societies, Nations and Races grown out of their infancy. I do not for a moment doubt the result of a vote upon this subject of the Theosophists in Norway.

I beg to inform you of the above, adding that I find it out of place to take steps in order to solicit votes about questions that have no actuality and which

cannot be endowed with legality even if unanimously agreed with by all Members of the T. S. in Europe as long as they are not carried according to the Constitution at a regular Convention.

Fraternally yours,

(Signed), TH. KNOFF,

President and Executive Councillor for the T. S. in E. (Norway).

P. S.—This information is sent to some other persons and Branches and also to the following magazines in Europe and America: England, "The Crusader" and "The English Theosophist." Sweden, "Theosophia." U. S. A., "The New Century" and "The Theosophical Forum."

LEGAL NEWS.

After the Chicago Convention of February 18th last, those officers to whom was confided the duty of legally preserving from destruction that part of the Theosophical Movement devolving upon the Theosophical Society in America, found themselves confronting a difficult problem. That the action of the coterie of persons who sought to absorb the prestige and property of the T. S. A. into the "Universal Brotherhood" organization was attempted without previous consideration of the legal chances to be taken was not to be supposed, however these chances may have been underestimated in the hopeful view that the minority might be stunned into inaction by the cunning and boldness of the manouvre; or that finding themselves slaughtered in the house of their friends in Convention, personally traduced, slandered, vilified, and in every conceivable way misrepresented in more or less private gatherings by persons of whom it is hard to believe that some at least did not know the falsehood of that which they assisted in disseminating amongst a mass of excited and over credulous hearers, the minority would surrender the ark of their covenant and retire in sorrow and disgust. Preliminary legal action was therefore taken by way of reconnaisance, in the application for temporary injunction, which having been granted was met by motion for vacation of same in the usual manner, accompanied by replies and counter affidavits. Judge Werner held these papers for a whole month and then, after premising that "It would be difficult to imagine a more interesting or perplexing entanglement than that presented by the record herein," proceeded to vacate the temporary injunction for a variety of reasons, all going to point out both directly and by implication the correct legal form in which such a case should be presented. The ground having been thus cleared, our suit proper will now be pursued upon the right legal lines and will come up for trial by jury in June, if it can be reached by that time; otherwise it will go over into the Fall term, which commences in October.

Of course, what the final legal outcome will be remains to be seen, and since there is no guiding precedent it would be idle to speculate upon it, as law courts technically deal only with rights of property or questions of material damage and profess no jurisdiction over moral problems or issues merely dependent upon ethical construction. This case, however, is unique and it is fair to assume that a jury will not be insensible to some of its peculiarities.

Neither should it be supposed that this suit is being prosecuted with the mere object of recovering property. It being far more important for the cause of Theosophy that the history and facts connected with our movement should be opened to public view.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING COMPANY.

As set forth in a recent communication from Mrs. A. Keightley, addressed to all members interested in the affairs of the above named company, Mr. E. A. Neresheimer applied to the Courts for the appointment of a Receiver and for a division of the assets of the concern. In the suit, "Neresheimer *versus* Keightley," the pleadings show that both parties asked for a Receiver. On Mr. Neresheimer's failure to agree to any equitable settlement, an application was made on behalf of Mrs. Keightley, for a temporary Receiver. The granting of this application was prevented, on technical grounds, by a sudden motion by Mr. Neresheimer for similar relief. On the return day of the motion, Mrs. Keightley consented thereto and was successful in preventing the appointment of Mr. F. M. Pierce, who was suggested by Mr. Neresheimer, and in securing the appointment of her own nominee, Mr. A. Falcon, as an impartial Receiver. It would have been Mr. Pierce's duty in that capacity, to take possession, sell and dispose of the property, and in view of recent events in the T. S. in A., it became a matter of considerable importance to have an impartial Receiver appointed.

Mr. Falcon, the gentleman appointed, promptly took possession of the property and arranged for its sale on April 30th. The proceeds of the public and private sales exceeded $4,300, but reductions will be made from this amount for the Receiver's commission, for legal expenses and so forth.

Some delay may take place in closing the affairs of the Company owing to the presentation of certain unexpected claims, *viz.*, one from Mrs. Tingley for $1500 as salary, alleged to be due to her for having acted as co-editor with Mr. Neresheimer since November, 1897; one by Mr. B. Harding for $900 for services; one by Mr. Page for $800 for commission. These claims will be opposed as utterly unwarrantable. The business shows a considerable loss during the past few months.

THE WILLIAM Q. JUDGE PUBLISHING COMPANY.

Mrs. Keightley's half interest in the Theosophical Publishing Company, bequeathed to her by Mr. Judge, will henceforth be conducted under the above name. In addition to publishing its own books, the Company will conduct a retail book-selling business. Orders for any theosophical or other publication will be promptly executed on receipt of the published price. Orders should be addressed to The Manager, William Q. Judge Publishing Co., Room 1411, 35 Nassau Street, New York City.

SCHOOL FOR THE REVIVAL OF THE LOST MYSTERIES OF ANTIQUITY.

This School was first referred to in a private circular issued by Mr. Judge on November 3rd, 1894. After his death in March, 1896, Mrs. Tingley took the matter up and publicly announced that such a School would shortly be founded by her. A fund was opened and subscriptions were received. In January, 1897, it became necessary to form a corporation in order to purchase and legally hold land at Point Loma, Calif., and a corporation was accordingly formed under the laws of the State of New York, entitled "School for the Revival of the Lost Mysteries of Antiquity." On Mrs. Tingley's return from the Crusade she objected to the Constitution and By-Laws of this corporation, as they vested its government in a Board of Directors and she expressed a desire to have the government of the

School in her own hands. This could not be arranged under the laws of the State of New York and a new corporation was accordingly formed under the laws of the State of West Virginia. The declared objects of this second corporation were made to conform to the terms of the will of Lady Malcolm of Poltalloch, who had left money to the School which it was feared could not be collected if the expressed objects of the New York corporation remained unchanged.

The stockholders of the West Virginia corporation, formed in July, 1897, were : Mrs. K. A. Tingley, Mr. A. H. Spencer, Mr. E. A. Neresheimer, Mr. F. M. Pierce, Mr. E. T. Hargrove. Mrs. Tingley was given six shares, and each of the other stockholders received one share. Mr. Spencer was the only stockholder known to have subscribed money towards the School, he having been one of the largest contributors. Mrs. Tingley being still dissatisfied, even with a six-tenth ownership, each of the stockholders immediately transferred his own stock in blank to her, this transfer not being entered upon the stock certificate book however. This made her the sole owner of the West Virginia corporation.

The stockholders of The S. R. L. M. A. (incorporated under the laws of West Virginia) then elected Mrs. Tingley, President ; Mr. Neresheimer, Treasurer, and Mrs. Tingley, Mr. Neresheimer and Mr. Hargrove, Directors. Mr. Spencer was elected Secretary by the Board. Mr. E. B. Rambo, in whose name the Point Loma site had been purchased, was then instructed to transfer the property to this new Corporation. Whether this transfer of property was legal is a very doubtful point.

Towards the end of March, 1898, Mrs. Tingley issued a notice to the stockholders, including Mr. Spencer and Mr. Hargrove, calling a stockholders meeting for April 9th, for the purpose of electing directors. But according to the Constitution of the Corporation the directors can only be elected at a regular annual meeting, which in this case had lapsed, the date for the annual meeting having passed.

As this was to be the first stockholders meeting since the first meeting for incorporation in July. 1897, Mr. Spencer and Mr. Hargrove feeling that they should be in a position to render some formal account to the subscribers, wrote Mr. Neresheimer, as Treasurer, on March 25th, asking him to appoint a time and place at which they could inspect the account books of the concern. Mr. Neresheimer made no reply. On March 28th, they repeated their request, and Mr. Neresheimer then wrote Mr. Spencer that he had heard from the President that Mr. Spencer was no longer a stockholder, and wrote Mr. Hargrove saying that he was on the train leaving New York "for some time" and would address Mr. Hargrove regarding the matter on his return. Mr. Neresheimer did not again address Mr. Hargrove on the matter, and owing to his failure to conform to his promise, Mr. Hargrove's attorney called upon Mr. Neresheimer on April 4th, in order to lay before him his legal and moral duty, as Treasurer, to allow his fellow-director an inspection of the Corporation's books. Mr. Neresheimer thereupon stated that he could do nothing in the matter without asking the permission of the President, Mrs. Tingley, and that his own attorney would promptly communicate Mrs. Tingley's decision to Mr. Hargrove's attorney. As it was evidently intended to elect new directors on the 9th, and as this conversation took place on the 4th, a prompt communication would certainly have been necessary; but no communication was made. On the 6th, Mr. Hargrove called at Mr. Neresheimer's office and made a verbal and formal demand to inspect the books of the corporation. This demand Mr. Neresheimer refused. A peremptory

mandamus was then applied for to oblige Mr. Neresheimer to give the desired inspection. On the 9th the stockholders' meeting was held at 144 Madison Avenue, Messrs. Spencer, Hargrove, Neresheimer and Pierce attending; Mrs. Tingley not entering the room. Mr. H. T. Patterson was present to take notes of the proceedings. Mrs. Tingley, Messrs. Neresheimer and Pierce were nominally elected directors, Messrs. Spencer and Hargrove protesting against the illegality of the proceedings.

Mr. Hargrove's motion for a mandamus was heard subsequently during his own and his attorney's absence from New York. Mr. Neresheimer made affidavit that Mr. Hargrove's motive in instituting this proceeding was a desire to harrass and annoy Mrs. Tingley and himself, and that Mr. Hargrove was actuated by disappointed ambition because he had not been elected President of the T. S. in A. These allegations of course had no bearing upon the case, nor upon the decision, but owing to the absence of Mr. Hargrove and his attorney, another sworn statement by Mr. Neresheimer, equally astonishing, and with a direct bearing upon the case, was allowed to pass uncontradicted. This statement was that Mr. Hargrove was not a stockholder in the corporation! Left uncontradicted, this sworn statement naturally had weight, and thus Mr. Hargrove's motion was denied in his absence. Mr. Spencer was subsequently notified that he was no longer Secretary.

The whole of these proceedings have been so hopelessly illegal—apart from the moral and honorable view—that it would be a comparatively easy matter for Mr. Hargrove to compel his reinstatement as a director, and to obtain an accounting of the funds. Other proceedings could also be taken with a view to recover a voice in the control of the school, and even the recovery of the school property. While feeling a certain moral responsibility to the original subscribers, Mr. Hargrove has no personal interest in the matter. He is perfectly willing to continue proceedings if the original subscribers desire him to do so; not otherwise. He is convinced that if Mr. Judge were alive he would look upon the present management of the school as more likely to lead it to its ruin than to a career of usefulness; but he considers that the submission of the above facts and this appeal for a decision to the original subscribers will free him from further responsibility. [E. T. H.]

REVIEW.

The English Theosophist, already grown to twenty-four pages in the second number, has the old vigorous ring in "The Editor's Remarks." Good reading this that must appeal to all still capable of independent thought.

Mrs. Keightley in "Is Autonomy Necessary," proves autonomy to be a *sine qua non* of healthy growth in any organization which can hope to influence the modern civilized man. Mr. Hargrove's article concerning the relations of the T. S. and the E. S. T. is reprinted from the *New York Sun*, and a short description of the T. S. in Europe, by Thos. Green, completes the body of the number. The usual correspondence, notes and news follow.

The subscription price is not yet given. (G.)

SUPPORT OF THE T. S. A.

The ball has begun to roll. Hardly a mail comes that does not bring pledgers to our fund. Of one thing pledgers are assured in advance—that not a penny of their money will be expended for the creating of a personal following, or for

the organization of any more wild-goose chases after notoriety. That is one of the things the Great Sifter has left behind. Work, *the* work, *our* work. Keep these words in mind.

Several have written to know how much each should pay. That is a matter in which each member should exercise the fullest "autonomy." We need all we can get, and could use more than we do get. The larger the amount received during the year, the greater good we can do, and the wider can the philosophy be spread. The actual, necessary expenses of headquarters, for printing, postage, wages and rent, must be paid first. The FORUM is included in these items. That is part of the *must*. None of us want to be without that. If any amount remains, it will be used for the printing of pamphlets and circulars.

Members must all understand that the amounts pledged have nothing to do with their annual dues. This amount, $1.00 per year, stands, as a matter of course. Any sums contributed through the fund are in addition to the annual dues.

The receipts ought to average about $10 per year, per member. That is, ought to be at least that much to cover necessary and desirable expenditures. Some can and do give much more. Others give much less, but I hope none will feel that the little they can give is of no consequence. Every penny helps. It were better to receive a thousand dollars per year from a thousand members than three times the sum from a hundred. The *will* is what we want. In this view of it, the widow's mite becomes indeed equal to the talent of the wealthy.

Let those of us who enjoy the inestimable privilege of living now and acting now through the grand old T. S., show that we are fully worthy of the trust reposed in us by those back of this movement for the elevation of mankind.

Fraternally,

G. E. HARTER,

Dayton, O.

CONVENTION.

The Convention at Chicago on February 18th last, having failed to complete its work, it has been thought advisable to call another. By request of the executive committee, I hereby give notice that a Convention of the Branches of the Theosophical Society in America will be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, on May 29th, 1898, for the purpose of electing a President, and for the transaction of such other business as may be brought before it. Among the resolutions to be considered will be the following: "Resolved that the term of office of the President shall be one year." Although members-at-large are not entitled to vote, it is hoped, nevertheless, that as many as may be able will attend, their presence and counsel being regarded as highly desirable.

Rooms can be obtained at $1.00 per day and upwards, and the coincidence of Decoration Day (May 30th), with the May Festival at Cincinnati, will probably bring about low excursion fares. Correspondence regarding accommodation should be addressed to Dr. J. D. Buck, 116 W. 7th Street.

A. H. SPENCER,

Acting President.